

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 were rejected, and claim 4 was subject to objection. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the §112 rejection of claim 1 on January 8, 2007. As discussed, in an environment where APs reduce their transmit power in order to mitigate possible interference (or just because they can do it), it is useful for STAs to know whether the AP can increase transmit power, and by how much. One way to do this is for the AP to advertise both its transmit power and its full power. Perhaps a more efficient way is for the AP to simply advertise the level of attenuation of its full power. In either case, from the perspective of the STA, it is the potential received signal strength that is important. For example, the STA can measure actual received signal strength, and then add the advertised attenuation level to the actual received strength to calculate the potential received signal strength. For these reasons, there is no need to define “full power” as being some specific power level.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Crosbie. The Office refers to paragraph 0047 for the recited limitation of “ascertaining, by the wireless device, whether the wireless device should attempt to associate with an alternative access point, the ascertaining based at least in-part on a level of attenuation of signal strength of transmissions from the alternative access point where the alternative access point transmits at less than full power.” Specifically, the office equates the signal strength with the level of attenuation of signal strength. However, as already discussed above, this different information can make a significant difference to the STA. For example, the STA cannot necessarily determine whether the AP can increase transmit power based on signal strength, i.e., either received or transmitted signal

strength. However, if the STA learns that the AP is attenuating its transmissions by X dB, then the STA knows that the received signal strength might be increased by as much as X dB if the AP were to change attenuation. Since Crosbie fails to teach the limitation that the STA utilizes the level of attenuation of signal strength of transmissions from the alternative access point, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Crosbie in view of Stewart. However, like Crosbie, Stewart fails to teach the limitation that the STA utilizes the level of attenuation of signal strength of transmissions from the alternative access point. Rather, Stewart uses signal strength measurements. Neither Crosbie nor Stewart appear to contemplate a BSS where APs transmit at reduced power to mitigate interference, or simply because no distant STAs are currently associated. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 is therefore requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 9, 2007  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/  
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 160-033  
Dd: 2/6/2007